## Contents

Li	st of Figures	vii
Li	st of Tables	ix
Li	st of Contributors	x
Pr	Preface and Acknowledgments	
1	Social Identity and Social Cognition: Historical Background and Current Trends Michael A. Hogg and Dominic Abrams	1
2	Integrating Social Identity and Social Cognition: A Framework for Bridging Diverse Perspectives Don Operario and Susan T. Fiske	26
3	Social Categorization and Social Context: Is Stereotype Change a Matter of Information or of Meaning? Penelope J. Oakes, S. Alexander Haslam, and Katherine J. Reynolds	55
4	Perceived Entitativity and the Social Identity Value of Group Memberships Steven J. Sherman, David L. Hamilton, and Amy C. Lewis	80
5	Perceiving and Responding to Multiply Categorizable Individuals: Cognitive Processes and Affective Intergroup Bias Theresa K. Vescio, Miles Hewstone, Richard J. Crisp, and J. Mark Rubin	111
6	Exploring Automatic Stereotype Activation: A Challenge to the Inevitability of Prejudice Lorella Lepore and Rupert Brown	141
7	Stereotyping, Processing Goals, and Social Identity: Inveterate and Fugacious Characteristics of Stereotypes Vance Locke and Iain Walker	164
8	Affective and Cognitive Implications of a Group Becoming Part of the Self: New Models of Prejudice and of the Self-concept Eliot R. Smith	183
9	Social Identity, Social Cognition, and the Self: The Flexibility and Stability of Self-categorization Dominic Abrams	1 <b>9</b> 7

CONTENTS

10	Implicit Self-esteem Shelly D. Farnham, Anthony G. Greenwald, and Mahzarin R. Banaji	230
11	Joining Groups to Reduce Uncertainty: Subjective Uncertainty Reduction and Group Identification Michael A. Hogg and Barbara-A. Mullin	249
12	Group Membership, Social Identity, and Attitudes Deborah J. Terry, Michael A. Hogg, and Julie M. Duck	280
13	Social Identity and Persuasion: Reconsidering the Role of Group Membership Daan van Knippenberg	315
14	Majority and Minority Influence: The Interactions of Social Identity and Social Cognition Mediators Diane M. Mackie and Sarah B. Hunter	332
References		354
Subject Index		398
Name Index		401

vi

## Figures

Figure	2.1	Individual-level processes and societal context lie along	
		orthogonal dimensions of research	46
Figure	3.1	The contextual basis of prototypicality and category	
		definition	66
Figure	3.2	Relative stereotypicality of checklist traits selected as	
		"most typical of ACU students"	69
Figure	3.3	Ratings of ACU students in general on stereotypical trait	
-		dimensions	70
Figure	5.1	The crossed-categorization design	112
Figure	6.1	Impression of the target person as a function of delay	
Ũ		and stereotypicality	151
Figure	7.1	Mean stereotype activation index for the high- and	
U		low-prejudice males at the short and long SOAs when	
		judging the positive and negative traits	170
Figure	7.2	High- and low-prejudice males' mean reading times for	
U		sentences either congruent or incongruent with the	
		stereotype of women	172
Figure	9.1	Hierarchical process model of self	206
Figure	9.2a	Category contrasts influence self-evaluations	209
Figure	9.2b	Different comparative contexts invoke different	
0		attributes for the same self-categories	209
Figure	9.2c	Category-attribute relationship is mutable	209
Figure	9.3	Social self-regulation	218
Figure	10.1	The display screen for the computer Implicit	
0		Association Test (IAT)	238
Figure	10.2	Demonstration of the self-esteem IAT	239
Figure	10.3	The five steps of the Implicit Association Test,	
0		counterbalanced for order	240
Figure	10.4	IAT effect, with raw latency score, is almost normally	
.0		distributed	241
Figure	10.5	IAT effect, with log transformation, is normally distributed	241
Figure	10.6	Rosenberg SES, raw scores are not normally distributed	242
Figure	10.7	Relationship between implicit self-esteem and gender	
0	/	positivity depends on gender identity	244
Figure	11.1	Ingroup bias as a function of categorization and	_ • •
		uncertainty: Hogg and Grieve (in press)	2.59
		,, _,, _	_0/

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	11.2	Ingroup bias as a function of categorization and	
		uncertainty: Grieve and Hogg (in press, Exp. 1)	260
Figure	11.3	Ingroup identification as a function of categorization	
		and uncertainty: Grieve and Hogg (in press, Exp. 1)	260
Figure	11.4	Ingroup bias as a function of categorization and	
U		uncertainty: Grieve and Hogg (in press, Exp. 2)	261
Figure	11.5	Ingroup identification as a function of	
0		categorization and uncertainty: Grieve and Hogg	
		(in press, Exp. 2)	261
Figure	11.6	Ingroup bias as a function of categorization and task	
riguit	11.0	uncertainty: Mullin and Hogg (1998a)	262
Figure	11 7	Ingroup bias as a function of categorization and	
riguit	11./	situational uncertainty: Mullin and Hogg (1998a)	262
Figure	11 0	Ingroup identification as a function of categorization	202
riguie	11.0	and took uncertainty Mullin and Hogg (1998a)	263
E:	11.0	and task uncertainty: Munin and Hogg (1996a)	205
Figure	11.9	ingroup identification as a function of	
		categorization and situational uncertainty:	202
		Mullin and Hogg (1998a)	263
Figure	11.10	Ethnocentrism as a function of category relevance and	2.55
		situational uncertainty: Mullin and Hogg (1998b, Exp. 2)	263
Figure	12.1	Effects of norm congruency and salience on	
		attitude-behavior consistency on measure of hours	
		willing to donate to a committee	290
Figure	12.2	Perceived identification by norm congruency	
		interaction on absolute attitude-behavior inconsistency	294
Figure	12.3	Effects of norm congruency and salience for	
		neutral-mood participants on attitude-behavior	
		consistency on measure of volunteering for anti-litter	
		project	297
Figure	12.4	Perceived effect of pro-ingroup and pro-outgroup	
U		campaign content on support for the promoted party	304
Figure	12.5	Perceived influence on self, students, nonstudents, and	
0		people in general of five AIDS commercials that students	
		identified as being good to be influenced by	306
Figure	14.1	Attitude change on the comprehensive exam and	
8410		marilliana issues after exposure to persuasive arguments	
		from majority or minority communicators and	
		proportion of arguments correctly identified	341
Figure	14 2	Attitude change on the comprehensive even issue after	571
i igul c	17.2	Autoude change on the comprehensive exam issue after	
		considered persuasive arguments from individuated of	
		nonindividuated, majority or minority communicators,	245
		and proportion of arguments correctly identified	- 343

## Tables

Table 3.1	Distribution of behavioral information in the	
	disconfirming-information paradigm	62
Table 3.2	Experiment 1: Distribution of information describing	
	students at the Australian Catholic University across	
	concentrated and dispersed conditions	67
Table 3.3	Percentage of participants assigning listed traits to	
	students of the Australian Catholic University	68
Table 3.4	Data from control studies of introductory psychology	
	students' Australian self-stereotypes (1992–7)	72
Table 5.1	Theoretical models of intergroup bias effects	
	in crossed-categorization contexts	117
Table 6.1	Ratings of target person by high and low identifiers	
	under different prime and delay conditions	153
Table 10.1	Intercorrelations between the IAT, measures of	
	self-esteem, self-deception, and impression management	243
Table 12.1	The prediction of behavior from attitudes and norms for	
	high and low group salience participants	294